

Phonathon: Who Gives? Who Gives More?

Julie M. Ripper
former Director of Annual Fund
Drake University– Des Moines, Iowa
Jmripper@att.net

Steve Krantz Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Nursing
University of Missouri – Kansas City, Missouri

Terri Deems
Adjunct Faculty
School of Education
Drake University – Des Moines, Iowa

Phonathon: Who Gives? Who Gives More?

Phonathon: Who Gives? Who Gives More?

Because of the necessity for fundraisers to solicit constituents in order to raise the most funds as effectively as possible, this research takes a look at the phonathon program at a Drake University, a small Midwestern University. The purpose of this study was to identify the predictors for the probability of securing a gift and the gift size in response to a call.

Five core recommendations were made to improve the efficiency of the phonathon program. Future research is needed to determine whether these findings remain true over time or how these results compare to other fundraising methods.

Giving – who, what, when, why, and how? These are important questions in the pursuit of raising money. In the United States, people contributed \$187.92 billion dollars in 2004, according to *Giving USA*. It is also estimated that 70 to 80 percent of all individuals within the United States make at least one gift per year. The commonly held opinion of fundraisers is that it costs on average \$.15 to \$.35 cents to raise a dollar. Thus it is paramount for fundraisers to effectively target their audiences in an effort to raise the most resources from the fewest people. Fundraisers can solicit these donations using methods such as direct mail, phonathon, face-to-face or door-to-door meetings and at events. In order to spend institutional resources efficiently, an understanding of what method works for which people is required. According to common opinion among fundraisers, this fact remains true no matter whether one is representing a social service organization or a University.

Current research in this area identifies characteristics of donors such as age, gender, marital status, or giving history through an examination of large amounts of data. This data was collected through large survey tools or through institutional databases (Schlegelmilch, Love, and Diamantopoulos 1997; Clotfelter 2001; Jardine 2003; and Chrenka, Gutter, and Jasper 2003). Additional research focused on creating a profile of donors' beliefs and habits (Van Slyke and Brooks 2005; Opinion Dynamics 2004; and Dawson 1988) by asking people to describe themselves. No research was found that specifically took an in-depth look at gifts made through phonathon programs. This represents a deficiency in the research.

Some research that did take a person's behavior into account when trying to understand donors has been presented (Quigley, Bingham, and Murray 2002; Ordway 2000). This research focused on discovering whether the acknowledgement process impacts renewal rates or amount given. Ordway's (2000) research created a predictive model of giving. This was accomplished by

weighing and scoring certain characteristics of alumni, then by using the results to test a hypothesis in a future mailing. The value of these types of research is that they looked beyond a broad description of donors or how donors describe themselves. However, while both of these research projects offer valuable insight, neither addresses who responds to the phonathon fundraising method.

Significance

At the University, the phonathon program utilizes paid students callers to contact its graduates and friends to ask for donations. For each of the last five years the University has raised \$250,000 through the phonathon. During the University's 2006 fiscal year, which ran from May 31, 2005-June 1, 2006, the phonathon program was transformed in order to improve results. This approach is now more aggressive, which includes asking for a higher dollar amounts and attempting to make the ask at least three times. The key to being aggressive was still focusing on building relationships with the graduates through the use of building extensive rapport prior to the ask. The time spent on this effort for each call went from two to eight minutes. This transformation also required a new organizational structure that included a new lead staff person. The initial response to these changes was positive. One indicator is that the average gift has gone from approximately \$66 to just over \$100 in only one semester. These numbers were achieved with basically the same number of student callers and a 19 percent decrease of donors. To continue to build on the success of this program, advancement staff members need to understand which of its graduates are more likely to respond positively to a phonathon call. There is also a need to target donors who are more likely to give a larger gift.

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to identify the predictors, if any, for graduates who gave in response to the phonathon program. To further answer the question, this research also explored the predictors for the size of the gift. The result of this research will be used to assist Drake University in utilizing its phonathon program to continue its growth.

Definitions

For purposes of this research, the following terms have been defined:

- Active Addresses – These addresses are on record for a person who is not deceased and where there has been no return mail.
- Attachment – Part of the interest score, as determined by Kintera®, which reflects the relative level of personal involvement and charitable inclination toward the University.
- College/School – This is the College/School for which the individual's degree program or major was housed. Since many people have more than one degree this field is most commonly used to store the first or preferred College/School.
- Gift – Those that made a credit card gift or pledge.
- Graduates – Those individuals that attended Drake, who in most cases, received a degree.
- Phonathon – This is a method in fundraising where, in this case, students are paid and trained employees whose purpose is to ask for donations over the phone.
- Screening – In this case, the screening was done by a vendor in the fall of 2005. This company was hired to look for wealth indicators and as part of its service, gave graduates a score for Attachment.
- University – Refers to Drake University, a national, coeducational, independent and private University in the Midwest with approximately 5,000 undergraduate and graduate students.

Limitations and Delimitations

The scope of the research included graduates who had given and/or pledged in the fall of 2005. For each graduate, the following variables were collected: amount of gift or pledge, gender, age, state of residence, and college/school. In addition, there was a variable collected by Kintera®, called attachment, which represented the graduate's degree of connection to the University. The interest score, which measures attachment, used various information weighted and scored by an external company for the purposes of screening donors for potential wealth. The data used in their formula were: cumulative gift amount, type of record, consecutive years of giving, whether they are a volunteer, largest gift amount, last gift date, and total number of gifts. Due to the private nature of this process, the formula cannot be provided.

One limitation of this research is that people may have only made a pledge but have yet to fulfill it due to the timing of this project. Since this research is really concerned with the fact that the pledge or gift was initially secured, the issue of fulfillment is not critical. Another limitation is that the quality of this research is very dependent on the information stored in the University's database. This database represents information collected over decades. The quality of the data is reliant on various processes, including self-reporting, to both create and maintain the records. However, since these graduates were spoken to, and their information updated by student callers, there is a good chance that the information obtained is fairly current. This would especially be true for those alumni who made a gift/pledge as it is the student caller's responsibility to confirm many of these facts while on the phone.

Literature Review

Each year fundraisers across the United States attempt to raise hundreds of billions of dollars. It is a commonly held fact among fundraisers that 80 percent of the dollars raised come

from 20 percent of the people solicited. Understanding characteristics that make people more inclined to give is essential to effectively target them. Though there has been much research on donors in general, there is less available that is based on donor's actual behavior. No research was found dealing specifically with phonathon programs.

Understanding Donors through Variables

Research attempting to understand donors through demographic variables typically utilizes data collected within an institution or through national survey tools. Much of the current research (Schlegelmilch, Love, and Diamantopoulos 1997; Clotfelter 2001; Jardine 2003; and Chrenka, Gutter, and Jasper 2003) looks at donors through variables such as geography, Gender, income or education. Results of this research can then be used to create donor profiles that allow fundraisers to identify people with similar characteristics.

Jardine (2003) examined 75,000 institutional records in an effort to determine whether geography is a predictor of alumni giving. This study researched graduates of Binghamton University located in New York who donated between 1992 and 2002. 38,000 of its 630,000 graduates live in New York state. Thirty five percent of those graduates made a donation during the time frame indicated. There was a recognized pattern of having large populations of graduates connected to larger percentages of those who give. According to these authors, understanding where alumni live by state, county, or congressional districts allow for institutions to target their fundraising efforts.

Unlike Jardine (2003), Chrenka, Gutter, and Jasper (2003) focus on the gender differences of those that give. The data came from a 1998 Survey of Consumer Finance. Findings included that women are more likely to give time or money than men. Moreover,

women tend to have a greater propensity to give just time. Education level and age also have a positive impact on the likelihood of individuals to give time or money.

Finally, Schlegelmilch, Love, and Diamatopoulos (1997) utilized a nationwide survey of donating behavior in Great Britain to identify which fundraising appeals work for which people. Findings included that men are more likely to give to raffles. Higher education and age are positively associated with giving and the size of gift. People who do not see themselves as religious give less. People who volunteered tend to give more. The perception of efficiency within an organization can also impact the levels of giving.

Understanding Donors through Habits and Perceptions

Identifying donor's habits and perceptions can help fundraisers tailor their message to specific groups. Current research (Van Slyke and Brooks 2005; Opinion Dynamics 2004; and Dawson 1988) in this area utilizes surveys that require individuals to identify their preferences, beliefs or values. Results of this research help create messages that garner a positive response.

Dawson's (1988) approach to understanding motives was to survey volunteers, donors and the general public about why they give. Though the objective of the research is to understand donors to medical research, the questions were broad enough to apply to donors in general. A significant number of people identified reciprocity as a motive for giving. A person's assets and age can have a positive influence on giving.

Van Slyke and Brooks (2005) conducted a study on the value of targeting those with great personal financial resources for fundraising. Data was collected through interviews with vice presidents of development within an organization and telephone interviews with donors. The goal of this research was to create profiles of donors and to gain a better understanding of the most effective fundraising approach. Findings included an agreement from vice presidents

that a more sophisticated effort needs to be made in the solicitation approach from those donors who make smaller annual gifts. Researchers also found that variables such as income, age, education, identifying oneself as Christian, being married and volunteering have a positive impact on giving. Yet just being asked actually decreases the likelihood of giving when connected with income, so the authors suggested that a more mid-level income may be more effective than just targeting those with wealth.

Opinion Dynamics Corporation's (2004) white paper discusses whether there is a correlation between an alumnus's knowledge of the college and giving. Findings from a collection of data from 669 college graduates in the United States stated that only 5 percent of an individual's charitable contributions would go to their alma mater. Likelihood of giving is in direct correlation to age and income. One third of the people who reported not making a gift to their University in the past year said they might if the case for support was stronger. Those that believe that their support of the University is essential are twice as likely to give.

Understanding Donors through Behaviors

Research trying to understand donors based on their actual behavior (Quigley, Bingham, Murray 2002; Ordway 2000) is more limited, especially as it relates to phonathon solicitation. Findings to this type of research can help understand what works and what does not through actual behaviors.

Quigley, Bingham, and Murray (2002) looked at the relationship between alumni loyalty and giving behavior by examining the impact of acknowledgements and communication on retention. Four hypotheses were tested on the effect of acknowledgement programs have on retention or level of gift. One set of hypotheses tested whether acknowledgement programs with frequent communication have a positive impact on retention or size of gift. They were rejected

because those donors with the highest retention rate had less communication. No significant findings were discovered relating to the size of the gift. Another set of hypotheses tested whether personalized acknowledgements have a positive impact on retention or size of gift. The first part of the hypothesis relating to retention was rejected based on no significant findings. The second part of the hypothesis proved to be true based on the increase of giving where personalized acknowledgements were used no matter the level of communication.

Ordway (2000) approached her research by first looking at donor characteristics and on a person's affiliation with his or her organization. The data was weighed and scored to determine a person's attachment. Then those people with a higher attachment score were solicited. Ordway discovered that this was an effective way to solicit and saw an increase in giving by almost 14 percent.

Limitations of Research

Research on understanding donors can be divided into three categories: through variables (Schlegelmilch, Love, and Diamantopoulos 1997; Clotfelter 2001; Jardine 2003; and Chrenka, Gutter, and Jasper 2003), through habits and perceptions (Van Slyke and Brooks 2005; Opinion Dynamics 2004; and Dawson 1988) or behavior (Quigley, Bingham, and Murray 2002; Ordway 2000). Research that looks at all donors by examining various variables is limited because it treats all donors the same. Yet differences can exist based on how they give, size of their gift and what they support. So when findings are presented that indicate women are more likely than men to give time or money (Jasper 2003), questions can arise as to how helpful this conclusion is to one organization. Researchers that engage the donors themselves in formulating an opinion about their habits and perceptions are also limited. This type of research has the expected bias of people saying one thing and doing another.

Overall there seems a lack of research based on donor behavior. Fundraisers frequently test actual behaviors to determine how to segment their audience. Ordway (2000) attempted to understand their donors through actual behavior, so she tested responses through direct mail. In doing so, fundraisers test behaviors to answer a question.

Methods

In an attempt to gain a better understanding of the predictors of giving in response to a phonathon solicitation, this research will compare those that respond to phonathon to various variables with the goal of creating predictors of giving. Most research in this area has attempted to understand donors as a broad group through specific variables (Schlegelmilch, Love, and Diamantopoulos 1997; Clotfelter 2001; Jardine 2003; and Chrenka, Gutter, and Jasper 2003) and through their habits and perceptions (Van Slyke and Brooks 2005; Opinion Dynamics 2004; and Dawson 1988). Some of the research found tries to understand donors according to their behaviors (Quigley, Bingham, and Murray 2002; Ordway 2000). No research was found dealing specifically with phonathon programs. This chapter will review the methods applied throughout this research.

Research Design

This research takes a pragmatic look at a small, private college's phonathon program. A quantitative, non-experimental approach was the strategy of inquiry, allowing for the analysis of the University's existing database that stores 50,000 records.

The database has existed in some form for several decades. It is a secure system that only permits those with specific privileges to confidential information. The access is structured so only the staff that has a mission-related purpose can access the most restricted information such

as giving. A researcher on this project has access as a member of the office of institutional advancement staff. Each person with such access is required to sign a confidentiality statement.

Participants

The participants in this research are graduates that were contacted by the University's phonathon program during the fall of 2005 (September to December). Since this is a review of pre-existing documents, no authorization was required. The criteria for records selected are graduates that responded during the phonathon program in the fall of 2005 (September to December).

Data Collection and Analysis

Variables upon extraction were analyzed using a statistical program, SPSS version 14.0. Descriptive and comparative analysis was done in an effort to answer specific questions. The analysis specifically focused on those who said yes versus no to determine if there were any significant factors or correlations based on nominal or interval/ratio variables. Standard test to analyze variance included t-Tests, Anova, Chi Square and Pearson correlation coefficients.

Potential Biases

Potential biases that exist related to the data itself and whether the variables themselves are the most relevant factors. The University does very little to ensure reliability of the information stored within the database. According to the University's records staff, 88 percent of the addresses are active and there is no way to confirm that the information is completely accurate. Since this research is focused on those that responded, there is an effort made to confirm basic facts such as address during each conversation. Therefore, there is some assurance that the information is good.

Findings

The purpose of this research is to identify the predictors, if any, for graduates who gave in response to the phonathon program. To further answer the question, this research also explored the predictors for the size of the gift.

The variables being examined to look for predictors are stored within the University's database. See Table 1 for a detailed description of the 4,324 records in the sample. The selection criteria for this study are graduates who responded to a student caller.

Graduates can be defined as anyone who attended the University, who may or may not have received a degree. Responses can be either positive or negative. Positive responses can be defined as a graduate who gave a gift over the phone immediately with a credit card or who made a pledge, whereas negative responses are defined as graduates who refused to make a gift or a pledge. It is important to note that a refusal may also include those graduates who disconnected during the phone call, as long the student caller identified that they were calling on behalf of the University.

For each positive response, the gift or pledge amount was recorded. Due to the timing of this research, a pledge may not have been fulfilled. When the term gift is used, for purposes of this research, it may reflect either a gift or pledge.

Table 1
Description of records included

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Response^a</u>			<u>Gender^b</u>		
Yes	1918	44.4	Male	2466	57
No	2406	55.6	Female	1858	43
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Gift/pledge^c</u>			<u>Attachment^d</u>		
5 to 99	907	0.49	Most Attached	1274	29.5

100 to 249	664	0.36	More Attached	390	9
250 to 499	175	0.1	Attached	31	7.4
500 to 999	62	0.03	Less Attached	851	19.7
1000 to 4000	42	0.02	Least Attached	1455	33.6
	No.	%		No.	%

College/school^e			State/region^f		
Arts & Sciences	1057	0.24	IA	1786	41.3
Business	1144	0.26	IL	592	13.7
Divinity	3	0	East Coast	420	9.7
Education	753	0.17	Midwest	1005	23.2
Fine Arts	413	0.1	West Coast	502	11.6
Pharmacy	427	0.1			
Journalism	369	0.09			
Law	158	0.04			
	No.	%			

Married Graduates^g

Yes	732	0.17
No	3592	0.83

Note. All descriptive counts and percentages are represented except for age. ^aResponse is indicative of whether a person contributed to the University. ^bGender is defined as male or female. ^cGift/pledge is defined as the amount given to the University. ^dAttachment is a score that was calculated by a vendor based on various information including giving and participation. ^eCollege/school is defined as the first college/school where the graduate received a degree and/or started out at the University. ^fState/region describes the place where the graduates resides or receives mail. ^gMarried Graduates refers to two University graduates married to each other.

Variables

The variables collected included: gender, state and/or region, married graduates, attachment score, age, and preferred college/school. The data was analyzed utilizing SPSS to

compare the effect of variables on response and amount given. See Table 2 for response versus variables that show to be significant.

Table 2
Response versus variables that show to be significant

Attachment**a									
	Most	More	Attached	Less	Least				
Yes	71.4	57.9	64.3	44.3	12.5				
No	28.6	42.1	35.7	55.7	87.5				
College/school**b									
	AS ^c	BN ^d	DV ^e	ED ^f	FA ^g	JO ^h	LW ⁱ	PH ^j	
Yes	47.4	42.5	66.7	39.6	42.1	49.6	39.2	49.6	
No	52.6	57.5	33.3	60.4	57.9	50.4	60.8	50.04	
Gender**k									
	Male	Female							
Yes	42.4	47							
No	57.6	53							

Note. ^aAttachment is a score that was calculated by a vendor based on various information including giving and participation. ^{b-j}Represents college/schools: AS is Arts and Sciences, BN is Business, DV is Divinity, ED is Education, FA is Fine Arts, JO is Journalism, LW is Law, and PH is Pharmacy. ^kGender is either male or female.

* $p < .001$, $p < .003$

Attachment. The attachment score is a score utilized to describe the degree of a graduate's connection to the University. The score was created by vendor that the University hired to screen graduates for wealth. One of those scores was called attachment, which was created by weighing and scoring graduates based on the following information: cumulative gift amount, type of record, consecutive years of giving, whether they are a volunteer, largest gift

amount, last gift date and total number of gifts. The vendor was not asked to disclose the details of the formula. The scores are ranked in order of most attached, more attached, attached, less attached and least attached.

Attachment is shown to be a significant predictor ($\chi^2 = 1056.921$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$) of graduates who responded positively to a phonathon call (see Table 2). Those records with a rating of most or more attached had a tendency to respond positively, whereas those with a less or least attached rating responded negatively. Most notably those with a more attached rating actually had a lower degree of positive respondents than those with a higher attachment score. Records with a least attached rating had a noticeably lower percent of positive respondents (12.5 percent) than all other ratings.

Comparing the attachment score to the amount given was shown to be significant ($F = 8.763$, $df = 4/1828$, $p < .001$). Most attached showed a positive relationship to those that were just attached ($p < .001$), less attached ($p < .001$) or least attached ($p < .002$). The median gift for records with a most or more attached rating was \$100 compared to the other ratings with a median gift of \$50.

These results seem to indicate that attachment is valid piece of information when trying to predict whether graduates will give over the phone. This may hold no surprise for many of the fundraisers reading these results because of the common sense connection of people giving to those things to which they are attached. However, due to the sheer number of graduates that have to be called and the limited time available to call, this finding can help to prioritize who to call first. Though there was a notable difference between those with an attached label over those with a more attached label, the sample size of 31 versus 391 should be considered in determining its importance.

College/school. Preferred college/school describes a person's first degree at the University. Graduates may have multiple degrees so this field reflects the first one of record. For those that did not graduate, it reflects the college/school in which their major resided. College/school options include Arts and Sciences, Business, Divinity, Education, Fine Arts, Journalism, Law and Pharmacy. Divinity no longer exists and the Law School is the only college solely at the graduate level. While college/school is shown to be a significant predictor ($\chi^2 = 24.620$, $df = 7$, $p < .001$) of making a contribution over the phone, there is relatively little difference between the individual college/schools (see Table 2). The only exception to this is Divinity, but the sample size is only three.

When comparing college/school to amount given, a significant relationship ($F = 3.479$, $df = 7/1842$, $p < .001$) was found. A Post Hoc test was performed and showed that only a few academic divisions showed a significant difference. Business alumni gave an average mean of \$61.65 over Education graduates, while Pharmacy alumni gave an average mean of \$95.51 over Education alumni and \$85.38 over Fine Arts graduates. The median gift for each academic division was \$100, except for Divinity at \$75, Fine Arts at \$50 and Education at \$50.

College/school was shown to be a predictor ($p < .001$) of responding positively to a phone call (see Table 2). The differences did not seem to suggest one college/school should be called over another. Yet, since Business and Pharmacy graduates had significantly larger gifts than Education and Fine Arts graduates, this may indicate a calling preference depending on the fundraising priorities. For example, if the goal is to raise more dollars regardless of participation, then Business and Pharmacy graduates may be better choices. Yet it may actually just reflect that the student callers felt more comfortable being aggressive with schools whose alumni

stereotypically have higher income, so they made a stronger ask than with Education and Fine Arts graduates, who are perceived to be at a much lower income level.

Gender. The gender of a person, either male or female, is a significant factor ($\chi^2 = 9.123$, $df = 1$, $p < .003$) in determining the likelihood of making a contribution over the phone (see Table 2). Females were shown to give at 47 percent of the time versus men at 42.4 percent. Gender was shown to be significant ($t = 4.319$, $df = 1848$, $p < .001$) compared to the amount given. Once a graduate agreed to give, men actually gave twice as much as women. The average mean gift for men was \$100 and for women was \$50.

Women are more likely to give, but men make a larger gift. Other research (Jardine, 2003; Chrenkka, Gutter, and Jasper, 2003) supports that women are more likely to give than men, but does address the size of the gift.

State/Regions. The University's graduates reside all over the world. According to the admissions staff, two of the largest populations originate from Iowa and Illinois. In coding state/regions, these two states were individually noted and the remaining states were divided into regions: East Coast (CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, MA, MD, ME, NC, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, SC, VA, VT, and WV), Midwest (AL, AR, KS, KY, LA, MI, MN, MO, MS, ND, NE, OH, OK, SD, TN, TX, WI, and WY) and the West Coast (AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, IN, MT, NM, NV, OR, UT, and WA).

Regions were also shown to play a significant role ($F = 4.391$, $df = 4/1843$, $p < .002$) compared to amount given over the phone. Though regions seemed to have an effect on the size of their gift only one was shown to be significant. East Coast alumni gave \$75.76 more than Iowa graduates ($p < .001$). The median gift for each region was \$100, except for Iowa at \$50.

Region seemed to have much less of an impact as a predictor of giving. Iowa showed a tendency to give less than all other regions. Though not all the differences were found to be significant, it may suggest that people closer to the University may feel different than those that leave the area. It may be indicative of those graduates who reside in Iowa are more likely to be involved or connected to the University. This could include volunteering or attending fine art or sporting events. At the very least they may hear more about the University and develop a different opinion than the one that they had as a student. Graduates located in Iowa may rationalize that they can give less due to their other involvement, where as those that move away rely more on their memories to determine the size of their gift.

Married Graduates. This variable refers to situations where two graduates are married to each other. For purposes of this research marriage may include those that are life partners. Though no relationship between giving over the phone was found, a relationship was shown to the amount given. Utilizing a t-Test and Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, these graduates are more likely to give than those who are not ($F = 8.438, p < .004$). The average mean for two graduates married to each other is \$175.75 versus those who are not at \$134.78.

Two graduates married to each other had a higher mean gift (\$40.97) than those who have only a single graduate in a household. This in itself was not a surprise based on the simple fact that there are two graduates versus one. Two graduates should suggest a closer relationship to the University. However, it was interesting to note that two graduates married to each other only gave \$40 more on average. If the University were to split the mean gift of those that were married to each other in half, \$87 each, then the average gift would fall well below households with only one graduate.

Age. Finally, no relationship was found between age and amount given. This may have been due to the fact that age was only available for approximately one fourth of the sample. It also may have occurred because this research looked at both graduates at the undergraduate and graduate level education therefore skewing the results.

Conclusion and Recommendations

What makes people give? While a definitive answer is hard to find, this research focused on identifying the predictors, if any, for graduates who gave in response to the phonathon program. To further answer the question, this research also explored the predictors for the size of the gift.

Findings indicated that there are predictors for those that give and to the size of their gift. Relationships were shown to exist when comparing response to attachment, college/school, and gender. Additional relationships were found for state/regions and married graduates to the size of the gift. Age was the only variable where no relationship was found. This section will continue to explore how these findings can benefit both the University and other institutions with phonathon programs.

Recommendations

From this research, several recommendations can be made to improve the amount of resources raised from the University's phonathon program. While these recommendations are not necessarily definitive, they begin to answer the question of how these predictors to a graduate's gift and size of gift can be useful. Overall it could be said that the findings can help fundraisers prioritize. The following recommendations will help to clarify how these findings can be interpreted and suggest a next step.

One. Utilize attachment to both prioritize those graduates that should be called and to determine ask amounts. A higher attachment rating was shown to be related to graduates who respond positively. It was also shown that the median gift for those that had a higher attachment rating was \$100 versus \$50 for those with a lower attachment rating. Yet no variance was found between the median gifts for those with a most attached rating versus more attached. This suggests that callers at the University may be able to increase the median gift of those who are considered most attached, thereby establishing more of variance for those with different attachment ratings. This result would reinforce the idea that attachment has even a stronger relationship to a positive response and the size of the gift.

Two. The University should make use of a graduate's preferred college/school to create a modified version of a script as well as to educate the student callers on a graduate's capacity to give. Business and Pharmacy school graduates were shown to have a higher average gift than Education or Fine Arts alumni. This would seem to suggest that the University's message to Business and Pharmacy alumni is working. Education or Fine Arts graduate's lower average gift may be the result of the scripting or possibly even the student caller's opinion that those alumni have less capacity to give than other graduates. Two suggestions are offered. First, educate the student callers on a graduate's potential capacity to give. This can be done by using antidotal stories or by using examples of a wide range of gifts to support these claims. Second, modify the message or script for Education or Fine Arts alumni. Find real examples of each school's priorities and how annual support makes a real difference. With such a tight focus on the message, there is potential for increasing the average gift.

Three. Test the difference in messages and gender of the callers on the impact of giving and the amount of gift. Findings indicated that women are more likely to give but men give

higher amounts. This may suggest that callers need to change the script according to the gender of the graduate. Student callers need to be flexible in their approach when talking to men versus women rather using one approach for all graduates. Then consider the impact of the gender of the caller on whether this finding differs. Finally, when calling married graduates, have the students be aware of how their conversation can change depending on the gender of person. Consider broadening the conversation so that the caller addresses things that may be important to both.

Four. Make the most of the student callers to investigate the issue of why graduates closer to home have a tendency to give less. The East Coast was the only state/region that was shown to have an actual relationship to the amount given over people in Iowa. Callers could be scripted to probe a little deeper for those that live in Iowa about their current connection or opinion of the University. This type of question could be added to rapport building to establish their current connection with the University. Then further research could be done to discover if there are broader patterns.

Five. Increase the amount asked for when calling married graduates. Findings indicated that households with two graduates had a higher average gift of \$40 versus those with only one. If the gifts were averaged by graduate and not household there would be a considerable difference. Therefore, when calling households with two graduates, the ask amount should double. To support that increased ask, it is suggested that callers recognize that two graduates are in their household among the reasons for support.

Implications

The results of this research can be seen in how it leads to other research opportunities at the University and to the base of fundraisers overall. Both areas need to have further research to test if the findings remain consistent as well as continuing to understand donors.

The University can continue to use this research as starting place for other exploration. Advancement staff can ask questions such to see if these findings remain true over time, compare it to other methods of fundraising (e.g. direct mail), or even drill down within this research data to see if only looking at those that fulfill their pledge changes the outcome.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this research took a look at behaviors of its graduates to identify predictors for giving to small, private college phonathon programs. The answer to who give is women graduates and/or those that are more attached. This research also explored the predictors for those that make a larger gift. The answer to question is graduates who are men, those that are more attached, Business and Pharmacy graduates, and those in the East Coast. The next steps in determining whether the recommendations above hold true as well as for future research are to test, test and test.

References

- Chrenka, Jason, Michael S. Gutter, and Cynthia Jasper (2003), "Gender Differences in the Decision to Give Time or Money," *Consumer Interests Annual*, 40. Retrieved from http://www.consumerinterests.org/files/public/GenderDifferences_03.pdf.
- Clotfelter, Charles T. (2001), "Who Are the Alumni Donors? Giving by Two Generations from Selective Colleges," *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 12 (2), 119-39.
- Dawson, Soft (1988). "Four Motivations for Charitable Giving: Implications for Marketing Strategy to Attract Monetary Donations for Medical Research," *Journal of Health Care Marketing*, 8 (June), 31-7.
- Jardine, Daniel D. (2003), "Using GIS in Alumni Giving and Institutional Advancement," *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 120 (Winter), 77-89.
- Opinion Dynamics Corporation. (2004). An Opinion Dynamics Corporation White Paper: Boosting Annual Giving to Colleges and Universities Through an Increased Understanding of Alumni Opinions and Priorities. Retrieved from <http://www.opiniondynamics.com/resources/whitepapers>.
- Ordway, Courtney J. (2000), "Characteristics of Giving," *Fund Raising Management*, 31 (7), 28-32.
- Quigley, Charles J., Jr., Frank G. Bingham, Jr., and Keith B. Murray (2002), "An Analysis of the Impact of Acknowledgement Programs on Alumni Giving," *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 10 (Summer), 75-89.
- Schlegelmilch, Bodo B., Alix Love, and Adamantios Diamantopoulos (1997), "Responses to Different Charity Appeals: The Impact of Donor Characteristics on the Amount of Donations," *European Journal of Marketing*, 31 (7/8), 548-60.
- Van Slyke, David M. and Arthur Brooks (2005). "Why Do People Give? New Evidence and Strategies for Nonprofit Managers," *American Review of Public Administration*, 35 (3).